DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 413 126 RC 021 210

AUTHOR McAvoy, Leo H.; Mitten, Denise S.; Stringer, L. Allison; Steckart, James P.; Sproles, Kraig

TITLE Group Development and Group Dynamics in Outdoor Education.

PUB DATE 1996-00-00

NOTE 14p.; In: Coalition for Education in the Outdoors Research Symposium Proceedings (3rd, Bradford Wood, Indiana, January 12-14, 1996); see RC 021 207.

PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Adventure Education; Corporate Education; *Educational Research; *Experiential Learning; Group Behavior; *Group Dynamics; Group Structure; Group Unity; Individual Development; Literature Reviews; Management Development; *Outdoor Education; *Research Needs; Team Training

IDENTIFIERS *Outdoor Leadership

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews the research literature published between 1992 and 1995 on group development and group dynamics in outdoor education and closely allied disciplines. The research is categorized in six general dimensions: (1) how the personal characteristics, skills, and experience that individuals bring to the group influences group dynamics and development; (2) how groups develop and are influenced by process and structure (covering developmental stages, team building, and group cohesion); (3) the relationship between functions and tasks in groups, and whether groups operate differently according to functions and tasks; (4) how leaders and leadership influence group dynamics and development; (5) how group environment--the forces and constraints arising outside the group--influence group dynamics and development; and (6) the impact of the group on individual members. The entire area of group development and dynamics in outdoor education requires further research. Nine specific directions for future research are recommended. Contains 51 references. (SV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 413 126

GROUP DEVELOPMENT AND GROUP DYNAMICS IN OUTDOOR EDUCATION

Leo H. McAvoy
Professor
University of Minnesota

Denise S. Mitten
Executive Director
Woodswomen

L. Allison Stringer
Teaching Specialist
University of Minnesota

James P. Steckart
University of Minnesota

Kraig Sproles
University of Minnesota

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Charles H Yaple
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

RC 021210

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GROUP DEVELOPMENT AND GROUP DYNAMICS IN OUTDOOR EDUCATION

Leo H. McAvoy
Professor
University of Minnesota

Denise S. Mitten
Executive Director
Woodswomen

L. Allison Stringer
Teaching Specialist
University of Minnesota

James P. Steckart
University of Minnesota

Kraig Sproles
University of Minnesota

This paper presents an update of the research on group development and group dynamics in outdoor education since the 1992 edition of these Proceedings. The research is presented within the six categories of individual and personal dimensions: group process and structure, group functions and tasks, leadership and power, environmental influences, and the impact of the group on the individual. The paper includes a discussion of pertinent research in the fields of social work, communications, and management. Specific recommendations are made for future research in outdoor education focusing on group development and dynamics.

KEYWORDS: *Outdoor education, group development, group dynamics.*

INTRODUCTION

In the first edition of the Coalition for Education in the Outdoors Symposium Proceedings, we presented a discussion and summary of the research that then existed addressing group dynamics and development in the context of outdoor education (McAvoy, Mitten, Steckart, & Stringer, 1992). Much of the research in our field has concentrated on individual and personal growth dimensions of outdoor education processes and experience. But those of us who lead outdoor programs know how important the group dynamics element is in the success or failure of these programs, and we also intuitively know these programs can be powerful incubators of group development. In our 1992 review of the research, we stated that there had been little research on group dynamics and group development in our field, and this dearth has not changed significantly over the past four years. There have been a number of articles, conference sessions, and book chapters in our field on various aspects of groups and our literature is full of references regarding how important the group is to the outdoor education process. But there still has been precious little research to pry open the black box of the outdoor education group and to describe and discover what is really going on there.

The purposes of this paper are to give an update on the status of research in outdoor education that relates to group dynamics and group development, to present some research and practice directions we see in closely allied disciplines (social work, communications and management), and to recommend some research directions we believe are important for the field of outdoor education. Because this paper does not repeat the information contained in our earlier article. The reader is advised to refer to that

Correspondence should be directed to Leo. H. McAvoy, Ph.D., Division of Recreation, Park , and Leisure Studies, University of Minnesota, 209 Cooke Hall, 1900 University Ave. SE, Minneapolis, MN, 55455, (612) 625-5887; fax (612) 626-7700; mcavo001@maroon.tc.umn.edu

RC 021210

paper for a discussion of the literature found up to 1992, a more in-depth discussion of some of the classic texts and theories that relate to group dynamics and development, and the non-research literature in our field that discusses group processes.

A number of authors give definitions of the key concepts used in this paper, but we have chosen to stay with the definitions by Forsyth that we used in our 1992 paper. Forsyth (1990) defines a *group* as two or more individuals who influence one another through social interaction. *Group dynamics* is the study of the behavior of groups. And *group development* is the pattern of growth and change that occur in groups throughout their lives from formation to dissolution.

There is a great amount of diverse literature, research, and theoretical material on group dynamics and group development. This creates a challenge to anyone trying to organize even the relatively small amount of research in outdoor education into a presentation that is understandable and illustrative. As in the 1992 paper, we have adapted a classification system developed by Weber (1982) and modified it to fit the topics for outdoor/adventure/experiential/wilderness/environmental education. This adaptation resulted in a list of general dimensions or topic areas of research and information. We then used the group literature to generate a list of specific topic areas within each dimension area and went to the literature to see if research was available on those topics in the context of outdoor education. Some of the topic areas and dimensions overlap, and some research articles address more than one topic. We tried to reduce any duplication, so the focus here is on the main studies found in each topic area. In this paper we present the primary dimension areas and the topics in each area, and we present the research we found in outdoor education that has been reported since 1992 in each of those dimension and topic areas. In some cases we also present research from others fields in the dimension areas—research that we believe relates to some of the issues and topics relative to groups in outdoor education. This research may serve as a guide for researchers in our field who want to address these topics in the context of outdoor education.

The general dimension categories we established to present the research are:

1. *Individual and Personal:* How do the personal characteristics individuals bring to groups influence group dynamics and group development?
2. *Group Process and Structure:* How do groups develop and operate, and how do process and structure influence groups?
3. *Group Functions and Tasks:* What is the relationship between functions and tasks in groups? Do groups operate differently according to functions and tasks?
4. *Leadership and Power:* How do leaders and leadership influence group dynamics and development?
5. *Environmental:* How do forces outside the group influence a group's development and dynamics?
6. *Group Impact on the Individual:* What impact does the group have on the individual members of the group?

The first five dimensions are all adaptations of Weber's classification system. We have added the last dimension after seeing an increased amount of discussion in the literature (social work and communications) about the impacts that the group and its processes can have on individual members of the group.

Individual and Personal Dimensions

The individual and personal dimensions area includes studies that consider how personal characteristics individuals bring to a group influence group dynamics and development. Specific topics in this dimension are personal factors (past experience, family of origin, gender, class, ethnicity, diversity, ability/disability, social skills, age, and coping skills); role choice; and intrapersonal/introspective capabilities of group members.

There has been little research in outdoor education in this dimension category. Ewert (1992) measured self reported levels of group development on a variety of Outward Bound courses according to age and gender. He found no differences according to age and only one difference according to gender (females were more dependent on group leaders).

Anderson (1994) used the experience sampling method, sociograms, and analysis of journals and interviews to study integrated groups on a wilderness trip program. She hypothesized that social inclusion would be enhanced by increasing the outdoor skill levels of persons with disabilities, thereby increasing the social status of these individuals. The results did not uphold this hypothesis. Instead, she found that opportunities for cooperation/ mutual goals and interdependence were the best predictors of social inclusion.

The ecological-systems approach is used with modern group work (Toseland & Rivas, 1995), which involves an integration of concerns among individual, group, and organizational/community collectives and situations. The system of social work is now a basic feature of our society, and group work has an institutional context. There is increased recognition of how influential the larger organizational or community contexts are and how their rewarding, limiting, and reinforcing aspects need to be dealt with in order to facilitate effective helping. This approach relates well to outdoor education groups. Our profession now better understands that we have to "know" our clientele and recognize, in the most positive sense, special populations. Each individual who comes to an outdoor education group brings personal characteristics and life experiences that makes that person unique. These characteristics will probably influence the dynamics and development processes of that group. Thus, in order to be effective helping, for example, women who have been sexually abused, we need to understand more about their experience, including how our cultural norms influence their experience. Likewise, if we work with clients from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, we need to understand their experience and the influence of the larger culture on that experience in order to use our outdoor programs in a positive, helping way (Mitten, 1995b).

GROUP PROCESS AND STRUCTURE

The group process and structure dimension has received some attention in the outdoor education literature, but much of that attention has been on proposed models for practice rather than on research. The research topics included in this dimension are norms, conflict, roles, communication, special groups, problem solving ability, cohesion/non-cohesion, authority/hierarchy structure, processing, group learning and group development stages/cycles. Research in this dimension has often concentrated on documenting the influence outdoor programs have on these elements of group process or, alternatively, that these elements have on group development.

The topics of cohesion/non-cohesion and team building have been the major emphases of the work done in the area variously termed corporate adventure training, experience based training and development, or outdoor management education. Priest and his colleagues at the Corporate Adventure Training Institute have been the primary researchers in this topic area. Please refer to his paper in this *Proceedings* for an extensive summary of their findings. Priest, Attarian, and Schubert (1993) also provide an excellent review of research on the effectiveness of corporate adventure training programs regarding cohesion and team building. Group development is one of the focus points in the model they use to frame their discussion. Another paper by Priest (1995) provides a summary of a series of studies that indicate that corporate adventure programs can be effective means of group development, that team building that occurs within adventure programs can be transferred back to the work environment if conducted with intact groups and accompanied with follow-up, and that certain group methods result in greatest team building. He also warns against over generalization of these findings due

to research design flaws that are often inherent to the process of evaluating the impact of these types of programs.

McEvoy (1995) used a randomized group experimental design combined with qualitative research and three-year follow-up interviews to assess the outcomes of an outdoor management education program in one organization. He found that the participants were very positive about the experience; that they learned significant amounts about effective communication, group problem-solving, and teamwork; and that they exhibited higher levels of organizational commitment, organization-based self-esteem, and intentions to apply learning from training following their experience in the program. Qualitative, anecdotal evidence suggest that at least some participants changed their behavior as a result of the experience. Two indicators of organizational outcomes (Total Quality Management implementation and sick leave usage) improved after the training, and the organization receiving recognition for increased task accomplishments and process achievements. The participant reactions to the training failed to deteriorate much over time. The research did not find a significant increase in trust levels among participants. The author attributes this to a problem in measurement of trust in this study, as well as a perhaps unrealistic expectation that a four-day experience can actually improve trust, which is a long-term process.

Wagner and Weigand (1993) studied a group of managers who participated in an outdoor management education program. Using self reporting before and after measures, they found improvements in group communications, team spirit, interpersonal relations, and group effectiveness.

Baldwin, Wagner, and Roland (1991) studied the effects of outdoor challenge training on group and individual outcomes of 358 employees who participated in a one-day outdoor management education program with self report before and after measures. They found self-reported improvements in group effectiveness and individual problem solving. Wagner and Roland (1992) summarized results of 80 one-day outdoor management education programs that served 1200 employees. Self-reporting before and after measures found the training appeared to have had a positive impact on group awareness and group effectiveness.

West (1994) used the case study approach to examine the perspectives and discourse of a group of at-risk adolescent students and their teachers in a junior high school program that incorporated wilderness activities in order to identify the communicative dimensions of team building and socialization. The author identified four categories that contributed to team building and socialization for the participants: identifying as a group, making personal contributions, recognizing the symbiotic nature of the relationships, and acknowledging the temporal aspects of team building and socialization. There were four characteristics of communication that emerged from the data: the presence of cross discussion; the disclosure of personal information; the reflective nature of the topics, as well as the process of communicating; and the use of stories. There were also seven communicative functions identified that contributed to team building and socialization: informing, integrating, regulating, exploring, coaching, acknowledging, and affirming.

Group cohesion is an especially important research topic for the outdoor education field. Group cohesion is the result of all forces acting on members to remain in a group (Festinger, 1950), and cohesive groups generally satisfy the needs that prompted members to join the group (Toseland & Rivas, 1995). Cohesive groups have positive effects on task accomplishment. In a meta-analysis of 16 studies focusing on group cohesion and performances, Evans and Dion (1991) found that cohesive groups performed significantly better than non-cohesive groups. Cohesive groups have also been found to have positive effects on members' satisfaction and personal adjustment. For example, Pepitone and Reichling (1995) found that members of cohesive groups felt more comfortable in engaging in hostile remarks and more secure when confronted with an "insult." In an extensive look at

the effects of cohesiveness on members of therapy groups, Yalom (1985) found cohesiveness leads to increased self-esteem, more willingness to listen to others, freer expression of feeling, better reality testing, greater self-confidence, and members' effective use of other members' evaluations in enhancing their own development. These are all important elements of outdoor education groups and deserve more attention in our research.

Group development processes, in particular the sequential stage models, have received attention in the outdoor education literature for a number of years. Kerr and Gass (1987) proposed an application of the five stage model of Garland, Jones and Kolodny (1973) to various settings in adventure education. Ewert and Heywood (1991) and Phipps (1991) have conducted preliminary research on these topics. The sequential stage model of group development proposed by Bales and his associates (1950) laid the foundation for future research on phase models. Since the model was first presented, a large body of researchers have concurred that groups do indeed move through sequential stages or phases as they progress toward a goal (Fisher, 1970; Tuckman, 1965); however, the specific order of these phases has been questioned by a host of social scientists (e.g., Bion, 1961; Poole & Roth, 1989; Schultz, 1958). Research has also shown that some groups do not accomplish their work by progressing gradually through a universal series of stages. Gersick found in her study that work groups progressed in a pattern of what she called "punctuated equilibrium" (1988, p.9) which included alternating inertia, revolution, and activity. She found that the groups' progress was determined more by the members' awareness of time and deadlines than on the amount of work needed to be completed in a specific developmental stage.

Most group development phase researchers do agree that during the initial phase of development members attempt to address issues of inclusion and dependency as they identify behaviors and roles that are acceptable to the group (Bennis & Shepard, 1956; Fisher, 1970). This initial period is often stressful for members as they seek to understand what type of group they are involved with and where they may fit. In the second phase, the dual issues of counter-dependence and negativity toward the leader are often addressed. Power and authority issues often lead to conflict (Tuckman, 1965) as individual members compete for leadership (Bormann & Bormann, 1992). Once the roles and norms have become relatively stable, the group enters a third phase that is characterized by increased trust and interdependence (Mann, 1966). This phase often creates an opportunity for group members to discuss the group itself, verbalizing concerns about roles, norms, leadership, or division of labor (Wheelan, 1990). The fourth phase is characterized by an increase in task-directed interactions as the group begins to focus less on itself and more on the task at hand (Tuckman, 1965). Finally, in groups that have a specific termination date, members start focusing on the upcoming termination of the group. This final phase may cause a disruption and a resurgence of conflict (Mills, 1964), although expressions of positive feelings toward the group and individual members may also occur (Tubbs, 1988).

There is a clear need for a situated model of group development as it pertains to outdoor education. Within the past ten years, small group researchers have made numerous pleas for researchers to move beyond the zero-history, laboratory groups that many of the current theories are based on and study real-life groups that exist outside of the university setting (Frey, 1994; Poole, 1990; Sykes, 1990). Many of the previously-studied groups were either explicit decision-making groups or therapy groups. Outdoor education groups usually defy these traditional classification schemes, having elements of both types of groups at different phases in the group's development. Outdoor groups also are often in a situation where there are evident ramifications of group actions and negative group development. The outdoor group often gets immediate feedback from the physical environment regarding these actions. The differences between outdoor education groups, both in types of participants and classification of the group itself, and traditional groups studied war-

rant more group development research in outdoor education. A better understanding of the outdoor group development process would help leaders and others facilitate the positive group development that research tells us leads to improved group performance and positive feelings among the group members.

Group Functions and Tasks

This dimension area concentrates on the influences that group functions and tasks have on group development and dynamics. Does what a group is doing affect how well it works? As with many of the other dimension areas, there has been little research in our field in this area. The research topics in this dimension area include: goals, tasks, action plans, problem solving, relationships, decision making, and outcomes/results.

As discussed in the previous section, outdoor education groups are often a combination of task and therapy/treatment groups. Toseland and Rivas (1995) use two main categories for dividing group work, task groups, and treatment groups. Outdoor education, in a traditional sense, would fit into socialization groups according to these authors, a subsection of treatment groups. The primary purposes of task groups (according to Toseland and Rivas) are meeting client needs, meeting organizational needs, and meeting community needs. Outdoor programs sometimes label their programs as treatment (this category includes groups that have a purpose of support, education, growth, therapy, and socialization). Other outdoor programs are far more task oriented. The category a group ends up in is related to the balance of attention paid to task accomplishment verses the socio-emotional needs of the group members. Both task and socio-emotional needs have to be attended to; the difference is the proportion of energy spent with one or the other. In the outdoor field, the balance may be even more confusing, since the groups are often self-contained living groups spending 24 hours a day together.

Two studies in our field have considered the outcomes of group functions and tasks. Estes (1994) studied Outward Bound (O.B.) participants to determine which elements of an O.B. course best conveyed the principles of O.B. She found that according to the participants, daily living activities with group members and the group expedition (group task and problem) best conveyed the primary principles of an Outward Bound course. McFee (1993) studied college students in a freshman Outward Bound type orientation program to determine the effects of group dynamics on the perception of positive learning experiences. Using an analysis of critical incident responses, McFee found that group development was very important to individual learning. Participation in a group that had progressed into the working phase was significant to increased learning.

There is a trend in the group literature toward a balance of group goals and individual goals (Toseland & Rivas, 1995). Early group work said that individual goals need to be put aside for the group goa(s) and, likewise, that individual goals were not compatible with group work. An important shift in the '90s is the focus given by corporations, as well as the government on empowering task groups. The goal is for these groups to function effectively and to recognize the importance of individual and group performance in the achievement of both individual and group objectives. We are seeing this same trend in outdoor groups. That is why, in part, we see so many workshops at professional conferences on ethics and on emotional safety in outdoor groups. However, we (the authors) believe our profession is behind in this area. As an example, in corporate adventure training programs, our profession for the most part still teaches that group goals are the desired outcome and teamwork means focusing on group goals.

Interestingly, these two concepts—that the larger society has a major influence on individuals' development, and that individual and group goals are not automatically mutually exclusive—have their roots in feminism. Feminist therapists (Lerman & Porter, 1990) have explored the concept of the influence of the larger society, especially as it relates to the development of women, including the oppression of

women and people of color. Mitten's writing has addressed the concept that individual and group goals do not have to be mutually exclusive (1995a, 1995c). Individuals and, therefore, groups are much healthier if both individual and group goals can be accomplished. Research into the role that group tasks and functions have in group development and dynamics would help us better understand this dimension.

LEADERSHIP AND POWER

The leadership and power dimension concerns research directed toward how leaders and leadership influence group development and dynamics. This is the area that has generated the most literature in our field related to groups, but little of that literature is research. Instead, much of our leadership literature is best-professional-practice-oriented writing, aimed at developing effective, safe, and ethical leadership approaches to facilitating individual and group development within the context of outdoor education programs. As with many of the other dimension areas, while there is a great deal of material on leadership and power in our field, there is little research that documents or explains the influence of leadership and power dimensions on group development and dynamics. The research topics within this dimension are ethics, leadership emergence, effective leadership, leadership traits, dependence/counter-dependence/interdependence, managing group dynamics, and leadership models. Leadership models, in particular, have generated a number of articles in our field. The reader is advised to refer to the 1992 *Proceedings* paper on groups (McAvoy, et al.) for a discussion of these models.

Some of the leadership models that have been applied to outdoor education have been the task-oriented models of the management literature, such as the Situational Leadership Model. As we discussed in the above section on tasks and functions, perhaps the typical outdoor education group is more a treatment or therapy group rather than a task group. Thus, applying task-oriented leadership models may not be appropriate for most outdoor education groups. Authors in group work and practice (Toseland & Rivas, 1995) have seen a shift in preferred leadership models in recent years. Oppressive, controlling, exploitative models that have limited the individual's interests and autonomy are being replaced by models of facilitative, socio-emotional, and practical task leadership that are better geared to democratic styles and to accomplishment of group purposes. These authors describe leaders as legitimate representatives of the group members, the community, and society who can motivate, inspire, guide, and empower people and, thus, influence constructive attitudinal and behavioral change. Two leadership models developed in our field since 1992 that focus more on the well being of group members rather than the accomplishment of group tasks are Mitten's personal affirming model (Mitten, 1995a) and the Fox and McAvoy ethical leadership model (1995). Research is currently underway to describe the effect the Mitten model has on group development and dynamics.

Irwin and Phipps (1994) developed an assessment tool to measure changes in group dynamics over time in response to leadership styles. Doherty (1995), in the context of a ropes course setting, studied the effects of facilitation styles on group dynamics and group development. Patterns in that data indicated that a teaching/ leadership style that incorporated the use of metaphors led to increased positive changes in the groups; however, follow-up testing showed a significant loss of these effects after 30 days. Meyer and Wenger (1995), in a qualitative research study focused on high school students, found that participation in a ropes course program increased group cohesion and team building. Gains included increased trust, confidence, concentration, and the use of goal setting principles. They also found that the adult facilitators who were present influenced the outcome by modeling appropriate group behaviors, by distributing attention equally among group members, and by their involvement.

ENVIRONMENTAL

The environmental dimension concerns the influence outside forces have on group devel-

opment and dynamics. The topics in the dimension include the outdoor environment (wilderness, camps, ropes course, etc.) and all of its various forces, program components, territoriality, spatial behavior, environmental stress, time demands, and fear/anxiety. As with the other dimension areas, our field has done little research on how these factors influence group development and dynamics. There is, however, some research on the issues of spatiality, territoriality, and crowding in the recreation resource management literature. Within the outdoor education field, Anderson (1994), in her study of social inclusion between persons with and without disabilities on a wilderness adventure trip, did find that the main predictor of social inclusion within the group was the fact that the group was in a wilderness environment. The participants in her study indicated that two characteristics of a wilderness experience—perspective taking and simplified transactions—contributed to the social inclusion (positive group dynamics) within the group. Priest (see article in these *Proceedings*) has some preliminary study results showing that in corporate training, the results are the same regardless of the environment (indoors or outdoors) where the experience takes place.

Much of the research on how a group deals with its surrounding environment is being reported in the management literature, including research that looks at the dynamics between work teams and their management environment. Ancona (1993) studied 50 consultant and new product teams in five high-technology organizations and found that a) teams develop activities and strategies toward their external environment, and b) that these activities are positively related to group performance. Environments present a set of constraints to which the group must react, they set limits on activity, and groups help "create" their environments. The external environment also plays the role of echo chamber: It amplifies information about the group. Ancona also found that if the group is deemed successful early (by management or other external evaluators), it tends to continue to be deemed as such, and visa versa. Thus, early labeling creates a self-fulfilling prophesy.

In order to be successful, according to Ancona's findings, groups must be in step with both the organizational environment and the external environment. Groups that follow an open model are more successful in dealing with their external environment. That is, groups that are more open to external input, to incorporating new member schema, and to incorporating new members are more successful. Ancona concludes, "Teams are effective to the extent that they engage in the types of permeability that allows them to predict, adapt to, and shape environmental change" (p. 240). The outdoor education field should increase its efforts to conduct research into this important area of the impact the external environment has on group dynamics and group development. Our field often considers the natural environment (wilderness) and the social environment only as interesting backdrops to what we often concentrate on, which is what is happening within the outdoor education group. We may do well to concentrate more of our attention on how these environments are influencing what is happening within the groups with which we work.

Group Impacts on the Individual

Groups—their dynamics and processes—have an impact on the individual members of the group. As practitioners, we often hear individual outdoor education participants remark that the group processes are often the most memorable elements of an outdoor education experience. Our field places a great amount of attention on facilitating a group to develop according to certain expectations we and our organizations have about how and to what extent that development should happen. Does this emphasis we place on group development lessen or, in some cases, negate the value of the development and situation of the individual within the group?

We found no research in our field that addressed this issue directly. Glassman and Kates (1990), in the field of social work, have proposed a humanistic group development model

that includes and values the individual within the group. They encourage group facilitators to take care not to manipulate, coerce, or control members. A humanistic approach to leadership during the beginning stage is especially appropriate in support groups, social action groups, and coalitions where the empowerment of members and the mobilization of their collective energy and wisdom are primary goals. However, elements of a humanistic approach, such as respect for the dignity and individuality of each member and belief in each member's potential for growth and development, are essential in all group work efforts.

An area of this research topic of special interest to outdoor education programs is the possibility of the group and the group process of serving as a framework for effecting attitudinal change of individuals within the group. This possibility has relevance if the organization's goal is to change group members' attitudes. As an example, one goal of an adventure program may be to instill and encourage minimum impact camping attitudes and skills in participants. Bormann's Symbolic Convergence Theory is one approach to understanding how group process can affect individual attitudes. In this theory the group establishes norms and roles emerge. The group sees itself as whole. Members share fantasies and rhetorical visions (symbolic convergence) regarding numerous subjects. The rhetorical skill of individual group members (including leaders) to persuade other members is important, as is the use of consciousness raising to influence group members to participate in the "appropriate way." The end result can be a change in beliefs and attitudes regarding certain subjects. This procedure may appear quite manipulative at first glance. However, most outdoor education programs are attempting to change participants' attitudes and beliefs in a number of areas. It thus appears that Bormann is simply trying to explain the process many outdoor organizations have been using for decades.

As Mitten states (1995a), there is the potential on wilderness adventure trips and in other outdoor education contexts to create a society that values the group at the expense of the individual. Leaders must not only understand the process of group development; we must also understand how the individual is affected by the group.

SOME RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND RECOMMENDED DIRECTIONS

We have included many of our recommendations for future research directions in the group dynamics and group development area in our discussions of the individual research dimensions above. The entire area of group development and dynamics in outdoor education is a little-researched area. We recommend that researchers try to pry back the top of the black box that is the group in outdoor education and begin to see what is really going on in this central element of our programs. In addition, we do have some further recommendations for research directions, including:

1. More qualitative research is needed to understand better the components of the outdoor experience, especially the components that have positive or negative influence on group development. We need to know how and why group development happens in outdoor education, rather than just concentrating on whether it happens.
2. What are the influences of an outdoor leader/facilitator on group development? How facilitative does the leader have to be to help create or foster change or development?
3. How effective are different group models (e.g., group support model, confrontation model, relationship centered model, personal growth model)? Do models used in our field fit "standard" group work models used in other fields
4. Researchers need to track the group development that actually takes place in outdoor groups. We need to concentrate research on the process as well as the results in a variety of populations, including clinical populations. As with the components of group development, we need to know how and why change occurs, rather than simply whether it

occurs. We need to identify variables and program components that cause change.

5. We need to compare productivity between low-cohesion (individual centered) groups and high cohesion (group centered) groups.

6 Research is needed on the impact of gender ratios on group success.

7. Is the group development potential of a ropes course equivalent to that of a canoe trip? Equivalent to that of a rock climbing program? Equivalent to that of a whitewater program?

8. There is a need for longitudinal studies that look at the long-term influences of outdoor programs, including the influences of follow-up strategies to reinforce changes that result from these experiences.

9. There is a need for empirical, multi-faceted studies that use multiple measures to determine program impacts on team building, trust, and group problem solving, as well as the long-term impacts these enhanced group dimensions can have on productivity and group outputs.

References

Anderson, L. (1994) *Outdoor adventure and social integration: A social-psychological perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Ancona, D. G. (1993). The classics and the contemporary: A new blend of small group theory. In J. K. Murningham (Ed.), *Social psychology in organizations: Advances in theory and research*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Baldwin, T. T., Wagner, R. J., & Roland, C. C. (1991) Effects of outdoor challenge training on group and individual outcomes. Paper presented at the 6th Annual Conference of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, St. Louis, MO.

Bales, R. (1950). *Interaction process analysis: A method of the study of small groups*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bennis, W., & Shepard, H. (1956). A theory of group development. *Human Relations, 9*, 415-417.

Bion, W. (1961). *Experiences in groups*. New York: Basic Books.

Bormann, E. G. (1982). The symbolic convergence theory of communication and creation, raising, and sustaining of public consciousness. In J. Sisico (Ed.), *The Jensen lectures: Contemporary communication studies* (pp. 71-90). Tampa, FL: University of South Florida Department of Communication.

Bormann, E. G. (1990). *Small group communication theory and practice*. New York: Harper and Row.

Bormann, E., & Bormann, N. (1992). *Effective small group communication*. Minneapolis: Gordon Press.

Doherty, K. (1995). A qualitative analysis of three teaching styles. *Journal of Experiential Education, 18* (1), 12-19.

Estes, C. A.(1994). Outward bound: The congruence of principles and practice. In L. McAvoy, L. A. Stringer, & A. Ewert, (Eds.), *Coalition for Education in the Outdoors research symposium proceedings* (pp. 22-32). Cortland, NY: Coalition for Education in the Out-doors.

Ewert, A. (1992). Group development through experiential education: Does it happen? *Journal of Experiential Education, 15* (2), 56.

Ewert, A., & Heywood, J. (1991). Group development in the natural environment: Expectations, outcomes and techniques. *Environment and Behavior, 23* (5), 592-615.

Evans, C., & Dion, K. (1991). Group cohesion and performance. *Small Group Research, 22* (2), 175-186.

Festinger, L. (1950). Informal social communication. *Psychological Review, 57*, 271-282.

Fisher, A. (1970). Decision emergence: Phases in group decision making. *Speech Monographs, 37*, 53-66.

Forsyth, D. (1990). *Group dynamics* (2nd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks and Cole.

Fox, K., & McAvoy, L. (1995). Ethical practices in the field of outdoor leadership. In L. S. Frank (Ed.), *Association for Experiential Education International Conference Proceedings* (pp. 70-

72). Boulder, CO: Association for Experiential Education.

Frey, L. (1994). The call of the field: Studying communication in natural groups. In L. Frey (Ed.), *Group communication in context: Studies of natural groups* (ix-xiv). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Garland, J., Jones, H., & Kolodny, R. (1973). A model for stages of development in social work groups. In S. Berstein (Ed), *Explorations in group work* (pp. 12-53). Boston: Milford House.

Gersick, C. J. G. (1988). Time and transition in work teams: Toward a new model of group development. *Academy of Management Journal, 31,* 9-41.

Glassman, U., & Kates, L. (1990). *Group work: A humanistic approach.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Irwin, C., & Phipps, M. (1994) The great outdoors and beyond: Common threads in leadership training on land, in the air, and in space. In L. McAvoy, L. A. Stringer, & A. Ewert (Eds.), *Coalition for Education in the Outdoors research symposium proceedings* (pp. 43-52). Cortland, NY: Coalition for Education in the Outdoors.

Kerr, P., & Gass, M. (1987). A group development model for adventure education. *Journal of Experiential Education, 10* (3), 39-46.

Lerman, H., & Porter, N. (1990). *Feminist ethics in psychotherapy.* NY: Springer Publishing.

Mann, R. (1966). The development of member and member-trainer relationships on self-analytic groups. *Human Relations, 19,* 85-115.

McAvoy, L., Mitten, D., Steckart, J., & Stringer, L. A. (1992). Research in outdoor education: Group development and group dynamics. In K. A. Henderson (Ed.), *Coalition for Education in the Outdoors research symposium proceedings* (pp. 23-33). Cortland, NY: Coalition for Education in the Outdoors.

McEvoy, G. M. (1995). *Organizational change and outdoor management education: A training program evaluation..* Unpublished paper presented at the Academy of Management Conference, September, 1995. Available at the Department of Management and Human Resources, UT State University, Logan, UT.

McFee, M. R. (1993). *The effect of group dynamics on the perception of a positive learning experience in the Outward Bound process.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Forest Institute of Professional Psychology. Wheeling, IL.

Meyer, B., & Wenger, M. (1995). The ropes course experience: Longitudinal examination of the behavior change process. In L. S. Frank (Ed.), *Association for Experiential Education International Conference Proceedings* (pp. 172-173). Boulder, CO: Association for Experiential Education.

Mills, T. (1964). *Group transformations: An analysis of a learning group.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Mitten, D. (1995a). Building the group: Using personal affirming to create healthy group process. *Journal of Experiential Education, 18 (*2), 82-90.

Mitten, D. S. (1995b). Healthy expressions of diversity lead to positive group experiences. In K. Warren, M. Sakofs & J. S. Hunt (Eds.), *The theory of experiential education* (pp. 187-194). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/ Hunt.

Mitten, D. (1995c). The value of feminist ethics in experiential education, teaching and leadership. In *Seeds for change: Proceedings for the Association for Experiential Education 23rd Annual International Conference* (pp. 175-181). Boulder, CO: Association for Experiential Education.

Pepitone, A., & Reichling, G. (1955). Group cohesiveness and the expression of hostility. *Human Relations* 8, 327-337.

Phipps, M. (1991). Group dynamics in the outdoors: A model for teaching outdoor leaders. In D. Cockrell (Ed.), *The wilderness educator: The Wilderness Education Association curriculum guide.* Merrillville, IN: ICS Books.

Poole, M. S. (1990). Do we have any theories of small group communication? *Communication Studies, 41,* 237-248.

Poole, M. S., & Roth, J. (1989). Decision development in small groups IV: A typology of group decision paths. *Human Communications Research, 15* (3), 323-356.

Priest, S. (1995). Research for EDTD and CAT programming. In L. S. Frank (Ed.), *Association for Experiential Education International Conference*

Proceedings (pp. 215-219). Boulder, CO: Association for Experiential Education.

Priest, S., Attarian, A., & Schubert, S. (1993). Conducting research in experience-based training and development programs: Pass keys to locked doors. *Journal of Experiential Education, 16* (2), 11-20.

Schultz, W. (1958). *FIRO: A three dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Sykes, R. (1990). Imagining what we might study if we really studied small groups from a speech perspective. *Communication Studies, 41*, 200-211.

Tubbs, S. (1988). *A systems approach to small group interaction* (3rd ed.). New York: Random House.

Tuckman, B. (1965). Developmental sequences in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin, 63*, 384-399.

Toseland, R. W., & Rivas, R. F. 1995, *An introduction to group work and practice* (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Wagner, R. J., & Roland, C. C.(1992). *Facilitators: One key factor in implementing successful experience-based training and development programs* (ERIC No. ED 345911). Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin. (ERIC No. ED 345911, Clearinghouse No. RC08688).

Wagner, R. J., & Weigand, R. (1993). How effective is outdoor-based training in improving management behaviors: A health care application. *Journal of Healthcare Education and Training, 7* (3), *1-4*.

West, J. (1994). The communicative dimensions of team building and socialization in a nontraditional instructional setting. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54* (8), p. 2800A.

Weber, R. (1982). The group: A cycle from birth to death. In NTL Institute (Ed). *NTL reading book for human relations training* (pp. 68-71). NTL Institute (location unknown).

Wheelan, S. (1990). *Facilitating training groups: A guide to leadership and verbal interaction skills*. New York: Praeger.

Yalom, I. (1985). *The theory and practice of group psychotherapy*. New York: Basic Books.